DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 165 SO 015 783

AUTHOR Nelson, Jack L.
TITLE Approaches to Education about a World Economy.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium and the Bundeszentrale fur politische Bildung (Irsee, Bavaria, West Germany, June 18-22, 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; Bias; *Controversial Issues (Course Content); *Critical Thinking; Economics; *Economics Education; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Global Approach; Nationalism; Stereotypes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Friedman (Milton); Fromm (Erich); Ideology; Kahn (Herman); Toffler (Alvin)

ABSTRACT

A rationale for skeptical and controversial teaching about world economics is presented by maintaining that the nature of economics is controversial and that ideology and nationalism are dominant obstacles in economics education. Following an introduction, the first of six sections discusses major stereotypes and perceptions in economics. The next section emphasizes the disparities in economics by presenting the views of economists and economic commentators Milton Friedman, Paul Johnson, Herman Kahn, William Simon, Fred Hechinger, J. R. Shakleton and Gareth Locksley, Geoffrey Kay, Stephen Rousseas, Joan Robinson, Erich Fromm, Alvin Toffler, and others. The third section encourages critical scrutiny of ideological bases for schooling, the functionalist world view, and nationalistic bias. Examples of obstacles to critical skepticism are given next, including laws prohibiting the advocacy of communism in school and teacher socialization patterns which push teachers to conservative mainstream views and to self-censorship and political restraint. Similarly, the following section describes obstacles to economics teaching, primarily the lack of adequate treatment of labor, unions, and economic views differing from mainstream capitalism. The final section presents a pedagogy for world economics, emphasizing the importance of controversy and critical skepticism, scrutiny of ideology and nationalism, alternative teacher education and professional socialization, the use of diverse and provocative materials, collateral efforts of professionals, and legal support for academic freedom. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack L. Nelson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED247165

APPROACHES TO EDUCATION ABOUT A WORLD ECONOMY

Paper for Presentation at

International Conference sponsored by

Bundeszentrale fur politische Bilding (Bonn, FRG)

and

Social Science Education Consortium (Boulder, USA)

Irsee, West Germany

June 18-22, 1984

Not for reproduction or quotation without express approval of author.

SO 015 783

by Jack L. Nelson
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903 USA

Criticism by Fred Newmann and James E. Davis of an earlier draft is appreciated.

Approaches to Education About a World Economy

Jack L. Nelson
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903 USA

Introduction

There is a hazy boundary between education and indoctrination, and in few areas is that boundary more hazy than in education about economic matters. Economics provides a primary rationale for identifying, explaining and legitimating power, and education provides a primary agency for producing believers. We come to understand the societal determination of what constitutes value, what accounts for production, distribution and consumption of goods and services, and the direct relationship of wealth to power, in educational settings: family, peers, media, and schools. That understanding serves to legitimate a particular interpretation of what economics is, how it should work, and who should be in charge of explaining it. Contrary beliefs are given little credibility.

In a nation-state the acceptable understanding of economics is deemed crucial to national survival, and formal education is expected to conform to those socially acceptable views. This doctrine of economic belief presumes a level of certainty about the subject of economics, that field's practitioners or seers, and their ability to explain and justify economic practice. The study of economics in schools becomes, in that circumstance, a study designed to inculcate a particular economic viewpoint as though it were truth, through which economic events and activities are to be filtered. This approach to economics as a

body of truth to be disseminated to the young is supported by social pressure, educator acquiesence or lack of insight, and certain scholars in economics and education. Such an approach may have been useful historically in providing a unifying national theme and set of economic values, but it becomes less useful in accommodating an increasingly global economy. And, the doctrinaire quality of economics education is antithetical to the concept of education as a liberating activity. This paper is concerned with several interrelated factors: the emerging global economy, limited standard interpretations of economics, the nature of education as enlightenment, and the need to reconsider educational approaches to a world economy.

There is increasing recognition of a developing global economy. The concept of national economies as completely autonomous is a political myth fostered by ideology and nationalism and transmitted to the young by schooling. Prior to the establishment of the nation-state as a political structure, economic activities transcended such limits. Trade in labor, raw materials, foods, and other goods across geopolitical boundaries extends beyond the limits of written history. Exploration of new terrain has commonly had an economic basis, as has political conquest. Humans have had intergroup, intertribal, interclan, inter city-state, international or global economies in some form over the course of human existence. The current state of global economy, then, rests as an evolutionary development but with potentially revolutionary consequences. The revolutionary portion devolves from the increasing awareness of dimensions of a global economy: its nature, structure and dynamics, and the recognition that traditional thinking based on nationalistic economic perspectives may not accommodate these dimensions. It is analogous to Marshall McCluhan's provocative view that we fail to grasp our own environment. We have an economic situation which has changed over a period of time but which has been cast into a narrower and traditional

perspective by economic, political, and educational leaders with media assistance. If the nature of economics is a body of agreed principles with limited controversy, education about economics should include the expression of these truths and assist students in coming to learn them. If a global economy is an extension of a national economy, or based on the same premises, then education about a global economy is greatly simplified - current aproaches to teaching the national economic truths are expanded to include examples from beyond the nation-state. If education is a process to instill beliefs and information without critical judgment, then, regardless of the nature of economics or of a global economy, the job of schools is to discern which beliefs and information must be learned, and contrary views and evidence would be exempted or disdained. It is the argument of this paper that none of these propositions about economics, a global economy, or education can be sustained: economics is not a body of agreed principles and truths, a global economy is not merely an extension of a national economy, and education is more than indoctrination.

Stereotypes and Perceptions in Economics

There are at least two American stereotypes of economics, each of which has some grain of truth, but which convey contradictory views. One is that economics is reactionary, drawing ideas from a narrow perspective in which Adam Smith is fundamental and private entrepreneurship is the human condition. This view is buttressed by review of standard textbooks for introductory courses and by newspaper coverage of leading economists who hold advisory and decision powers in the U. S. government. The variation among them amounts to tinkering with a system, not critique of it. There is a public impression of widespread basic agreement on the certainty and superiority of capitalism in its American form.

Yet another American stereotype is that economics is in chaos, giving conflicting, confusing and confounding explanations and advice. This view is buttressed by following the varied predictions by economists and economic research bureaus and reading the diverse explanations of national and global economic events like recessions, unemployment, multi-national corporation activities, inflation, tariff alterations, IMF or World Bank maneuvers, monetary structures, interest rates and others. Economists, in this second view, are more similar to weathermen or educators than to physicists in the certainty of their science.

Socialism is generally perceived as an evil among the American public, and this is expressed through the schools. Any economic system or theory which seems to threaten the public perception of capitalism carries such a negative valence that it obstructs reason and confounds attempts at enlightenment. There may be some distrust of certain capitalistic notions in the U.S., but capitalism is accepted as a basic, unchallenged premise in standard economic education. This seems to be fostered by a sense of natural law that permeates much American economic literature and the nationalistic character of American education. That there is legitimate and thoughtful debate at more esoteric levels on the nature of economics has not penetrated the public economic literature or educational structures. Thus, socialism is poorly studied or understood in the U.S. because of its ideological overload. And economic explanations beyond standard capitalism or socialism, in relatively classic form, are virtually non-existent in schools. This is an educational and economic failure on a large scale. It is of global proportions since the threat of true believers in the rhetoric of socialism or capitalism has the potential for world chaos and violence.

These American stereotypes have their parallels in other countries, though there is more or less openness in public debate and schooling in differing nations. It is of concern here to suggest that economics is, in fact, a field of uncertainty and controversy. The doctrinaire quality of economic explanation derives more from ideology than from critical examination, and there is dogmatism among those professing orothodox and critical stances. The argument here is not that the professing of certainty doesn't exist; it is a standard in economic literature. Rather, the point is that the certainties expressed are contradictory or confusing, and the conclusion is that the field is one of uncertainty and conflict. The purpose for this exercise is to then present pedagogical implications as representative of the the nature of economics as controversial instead of settled.

Economics as Controversy

Despite major efforts by some economists to produce a science of economics which is theoretically pure and which can be used to predict and control with certainty the workings of economic systems, there remains much which is mystical about value, resources, production, allocation, scarcity and other terms economists have utilized in attempts to explain economic phenomena. The very language used by economists is subject to scrutiny for ideological bias. The larger scale orthodox economic positions, notably capitalism and socialism, are ideologies which produce adherents rather than thoughtful criticism and modification into more elegant or more powerful theories in a global context. While some may consider this dismal, it actually represents an opportunity for education and economics. In areas of certainty, education becomes no more than memorization; it is indoctrination since all one can learn is whatever the certainty is, and that is beyond criticism if one accepts it. Fundamental religions, and those who apply strict limits on the nature of their fields, typify, this notion of certainty. The dogma is there to be learned,

not questioned. Certainty in economics seems to produce ideologues rather than critical thinkers. For that reason Kenneth Boulding's reference to economics as a "moral science" (1968) is appropriate. Similarly, Thurman Arnold (1962; 1937) comments, "Basic economic beliefs are religious in character." (pxxiii)

An example of economic certainty, with ideological bases, is expressed by Friedman in his exploration of the relation between economic and political freedom:

> Fundamentally, there are only two ways of co-ordinating the economic activities of millions. One is central direction involving the use of coercion--the technique of the army and of the modern totalitarian state. The other is voluntary co-operation of individuals--the technique of the market place. (Friedman, 1962 p. 13)

This division of the world into two parts has many historic precedents. It flows obviously from basic concepts of good and evil, and simplifies arguments, evidence and decisions. Friedman does provide elaboration of this bi-polar premise, noting that it is more difficult to detail the exact workings of institutional arrangements that support his concept of a free market and stating that "much of technical economic literature is concerned with precisely these questions." (p. 14). He points out three problems: preventing physical coercion and enforcing contracts among private individuals, monopoly, and effects on third parties. He also disposes of critics with the comment, "underlying most arguments against the free market is a lack of belief in freedom itself." (p. 15). Friedman's excursion into world economics in 1962 centered on trade relations among countries, involving advocacy of free markets in gold and foreign exchange, as well as abolition of trade restrictions. He does not speak of an international structure to govern, in however limited a fashion, the operations of a world economy to ensure the same "rules of the game" he suggests for national governments to maintain a free market within a country. Government, he holds should only fulfill the functions of defining property rights, adjudicating

disputes, enforcing contracts, providing a monetary structure, countering technical monopolies, cautiously intervening in third party effects like pollution, and supplementing private charity for the "irresponsible." (p. 34).

In a book produced by the Ethics and Public Policy Center of Georgetown University, (1979) Paul Johnson relates the development of industrial capitalism to rapid economic growth and comments that "one could argue that it [industrial capitalism] is the greatest single blessing ever bestowed on humanity." (p. 5). Johnson, a former editor of New Statesman who revolted, poses five threats to capitalism: the collectivist prejudice of western intellectuals in higher education, the impact of ecology campaigners, the growth of big government, trade union activity, and totalitarian communist governments. He argues that the fate of capitalism rests on the United States, West Germany, and Japan, and that the U. S. must keep up the arms race because of the communist threat to capitalism. This poses ideological, national and global factors in economic terms.

Johnson's comments were echoed, with slight modification, by Alan Reynolds, economist and former economics editor of National Review, Michael Novak, scholar-in-residence at the American Enterprise Institute, Paul Craig Roberts, economist and senior research fellow at the Hoover Institute, and Herman Kahn, economist and director of the Hudson Institute. Kahn, as a predictor of the future, does not believe that free enterprise is losing a moral or intellectual battle; he notes a worldwide "conservative renaissance," but he agrees with Johnson that: "many activities of the media and the educational establishment are destructive. In particular, the miseducation of young students, ideologically and practically, is a central problem..." (Kahn, 1979 p. 67)

This educational theme in economic literature has been expressed even more forcefully in the writings of people like William Simon, former U. S. Secretary of the Treasury, who complains that, "most private funds, inevitably from business itself, flow ceaselessly to the very institutions which are philosophically committed to the destruction of capitalism" (Simon, 1978, p. 228). Simon noted the resignation of Henry Ford II from the Ford Foundation because of its presumed criticism of capitalism, and Simon urges the development of a "powerful counter-intelligentsia" financed by businessmen to counteract the alleged anti-capitalist bias in the intellectual community. Further, Simon calls upon business to quit "subsidizing of colleges and universities whose departments of economics, government, politics and history are hostile to capitalism..." (p. 231).

The development of a "free enterprise" fund, state laws requiring free enterprise courses in schools, and endowed chairs in free enterprise at major colleges and universities illustrate the practical effect of economic ideology on education. Fred Hechinger, columnist for the New York Times, identified a few examples of this activity, such as the Goodyear Tire Company provision of $250,000 for a Professorship of Free Enterprise. He quoted a businessman who financed another such chair at Ohio State as saying, "Since universities teach youngsters about the Communist, socialist and fascist systems, there is a real need to teach about American free enterprise" (Hechinger, 1978, p. 14). Several states legislated required courses in free enterprise economics for secondary school students in every school. Florida, Illinois, Utah and Louisiana are among these. Utah, for example, requires that schools "not only offer a course in the Free Enterprise System, but they shall also becomes advocates..." (Davis, 1983) This, and the Utah law specification that socialism is a failed system, require a certainty and non-controversy in economics that would limit education to the study and acceptance of only free enterprise structures. Even within that severe and intellectually unsupportable limitation, there is still great controversy.

Shakleton and Locksley (1981) in a volume of separate essays which treat a dozen contemporary economists in terms of their backgrounds and economic contributions, note that economics is a "diverse science," although the same introductory remarks later challenge the very concept of science. This is a rather defensive book, arguing that economists get a bad press "and deserve a better one," (p. 1) and commending the diversity in economics: "But our assertion and celebration of this diversity should not lay us open to the alternative criticism, that the economics scene is just a confusion of idiosyncratic academics, each with his or her [there is one woman economist, Joan Robinson, included in this work] own pet theory to peddle" (p. 2). The editors go on to indicate that their determination of which economists to include in the volume was based on three criteria: 1) their work was within the past 40 years; 2) each had made original contributions; and 3) each had a major influence on other economists. Yet, the editors agree that the only category which encompasses the twelve economists is that of "bourgeois economists," and that "despite the increasingly hard quantitative nature of economic science, most of the really interesting questions in economics remain questions of interpretation and advocacy." Thus, this volume of diversity does not include "proletarian" or other more radical economists, and admits to the "science" of economics as more interestingly subject to interpretation and advocacy, than to science and mathematical models. This book illustrates the concept of controversy and uncertainty in economics, even where the basic ideology is shared. Its chapters on Gary Becker, James Buchanan, Milton Friedman, John K. Galbraith, F. A. Von Hayek, John Hicks, Michael Kalecki, Wassily Leontief, Lionel Robbins, Joan Robinson, Paul Samuelson, and Piero Sraffa, show dissent even within the more narrow framework of bourgeois economics.

An economic framework which is not included in that book, and which shows further divergence in economics, is illustrated by the work of Kay (1979), who notes that, "Inevitably any work of Marxist theory must come into opposition with orthodox economics which rejects its premises and perspectives completely... too much attention to economics as it is traditionally defined and taught can only be misleading...[it is] nothing more than an accurate theoretical expression of the irrationality of a society whose obscenities it justifies, and then celebrates, as natural and eternal" (p. x).

Among his other criticisms, Kay comments that "Keynesianism, despite its protestations of internationalism, makes the national economy its focus of attention and, moreover, the national economy of the advanced capitalist country" (p. 124). Kay notes that this lack of global economic theory or explanation derives from a primary concern with policy and an acceptance of the nation-state as the agent of policy. This suggests a political, rather than scientific, form for economics; more traditional, but perhaps more suitable.

While Kay utilized a standard Marxian framework for his critique of capitalism, examining the inadequacies of limited definitions of labor, capital, profit, money and value, Rousseas (1979) undertook an analysis of neo-Marxist and post Keynesian literature because of his concern that each had concentrated too heavily on internal dispute to consider the other's works with anything but complete disdain. Rousseas notes his own training in "the pseudo scientific sterility of orthodox economics" and commends the Marxists and neo-Marxists for stimulating critical review. He similarly commends Joan Robinson's work for her attack on "pre-Keynesian economists after Keynes," and her restoration of Keynesian theory to its "original critical purpose." It is this revitalized critical purpose which gave rise to the

post-Keynesians. Paul Davidson (1980), editor of the Journal of Post-Keynesian Economics, echoes this point, noting a major crisis in economic theory--a crisis which illustrates the uncertainty and controversy of the field.

In discussing the problem of capitalist legitimation Rousseas describes the relation among ideology, economics, and science: "The critical fusion of science and ideology, in other words, provided the legitimating power of capitalism by basing the 'laws' of bourgeois economics on the 'unalterable foundations of science.'" The functional characteristic of this use of science and quantification to freeze the status quo in economic relations into a presumption of natural law is to provide a basis for capitalism that is beyond critical judgment. There is, thus, a challenge to the presumption of a science of economics; such a science can be seen as only another mystification to hide ideology.

Further, in relation to global issues in economics, Rousseas plots the utilization of arms production by capitalist societies to stave off the catastrophe predicted by many critics. It is the theme of this book that the old and new Marxists have not adequately accounted for the "resiliency of capitalism and its remarkable instinct for survival." Part of that explanation rests on massive expenditures for armaments, and armaments require a political and economic rationale beyond the nation-state.

This is a position that is not only part of the standard Marxist interpretation of capitalism's propensity for a war machine to fuel the economy; it also follows a Keynesian analysis (Gintis, 1968), a more standard capitalist framework. (Clark, 1966), and an analysis of all planned economics, socialist or non-socialist, where military expenditure is adapted to meet industrial needs (Galbraith, 1967).

Joan Robinson (1983) posed the issue at a conference in 1980:

> We are sitting around discussing ideas totally beside the point. The important question is not whether the rate of inflation is high or low or can be brought under control but whether our generation will succeed in destroying the world. We are seeing the supply of arms pile up as Americans and Soviets advance from one missile system to the next... The Arms race is too serious a matter for us to be content to dispute economic theories that float off into the stratosphere... In the present climate, an intelligent economic policy is seen to lead to dangerous thoughts. Employment, welfare and other relief programs are regarded as dangerous because they are considered to be socialist... But it is always easy to obtain votes for defense spending, the means to finance destruciopn are easier to provide than the means to combat unemployment and poverty.

The nationalistic basis of decisions regarding a global economy are reflected in more than the arms race. The New International Economic Order, supported by many at United Nations meetings during the past several years has faltered on ideological and national grounds. It is not even a global economy, but international, yet it has severe problems on national grounds. Among the main findings of the Committee for Development Planning reported in a U. N. document is that, "The deterioration in the international economic situation is in part due to policies pursued in countries with a preponderant weight in the world economy, seeking to solve their problems on a national basis" (World Economic Recovery, 1982, p. 3). This committee also expressed alarm at the rising trend of military expenditure and at the "misguided" view that such spending will stimulate economic recovery. This was expressed as a problem of nationalism in world economics. As Henry Kissinger (1974) stated at the United Nations, "The complex, fragile structure of global economic cooperation required to sustain national economic growth stands in danger of being shattered." Kissinger was concerned that capitalist countries, seeking more resources, growth

and capital, will produce increased economic nationalism and dissension among themselves. He was, obviously. also concerned to protect his own nationalistic vision of a new international economic order.

Rousseas (1970) commented in his analysis of neo-Marxism and post-Keynesianism that capitalism's requirements for growth and capital accumulation are likely to lead to advanced planned capitalism on a global scale, and to potential revolutions, authoritarian responses and war. Yet, recent reports (New York Times, January 9, 1984) indicate that China, with a command economy based on socialism, is beginning to invest in capitalist industries in the U. S. Perhaps Erich Fromm (1961) was prophetic in arguing that there will be an accommodation between current examples of capitalism and socialism. It has, however, not happened yet. And the dominant patterns of ideology and nationalism persist.

Even if Fromm were to be proven prophetic, there are other disputes in global economics which go beyond the rhetoric of capitalism and socialism. Some challenge the basic economic concept of scarcity (Theobald, 1970, Bookchin, 1971); another speaks of central and peripheral countries and their infrastructure regardless of economic ideology (Galtung, 1980); and some heap a plague on the houses of both capitalists and socialists since neither recognizes a new entropic world view and the inherent collapse of the environment from economic and other forces (Rifkin, 1980); or neither produce the liberated human. (Servan-Schreiber, 1971)

Alvin Toffler (1970) points out the lack of imagination among economists, "Conditioned to think in straight line terms, economists have great difficulty imagining alternatives to communism and capitalism" (p. 194). He raises questions about growth, supra national economics, psychic values, post-industrial structures and the like, and suggests that the conflict between capitalism and communism will

be reduced to comparative insignificance in a future world. He also decried the condition of education which seems unprepared to provide for the future in a "superindustrial world."

In summary, economics is essentially a field of controversy. The disparities among economists and economic commentators are wide, and newer ideas about world economics expand the gap. Important strands of these disputes include the idea that economic theories are expounded as truth while they are often grounded in ideologies that support nationalistic strategies. And these strategies are of enormous consequence in comprehending global economics and in considering a peaceful and civilizing world system. Controversy is healthy in economics as in other areas of human vitality; education deserves equitable opportunity to be controversial but, more importantly, to engage students in an understanding of the nature, dimensions, and potential consequences of controversies in economics.

Considering Controversial & Skeptical Education

Education, as a subject of study, is equal to economics in its uncertainty and controversy. We are not adequately knowledgeable to speak with certainty on how learning occurs, who should be educated, what are the true forms and sequences of knowledge, or how schooling should be organized and operated. This paper needn't elaborate this topic, it is the subject of contemporary debate throughout the world. Rather, it is indicated here to suggest a level of equivalent skepticism about education, as about economics, and the pedagogical considerations presented here. The questions above about learning, schooling, and knowledge, in addition to more theoretic issues about the purposes of education, are open to discourse. Yet, these questions require applied answers at a given time; we can't wait for certainty, especially since it is so unlikely to occur, and educational decisions must be made.

A basic principle is that education's primary goal is continual enlightenment. Enlightenment incorporates both content and process: content includes whatever data, generalizations, concepts and values are available for consideration from historic and contemporary sources, and process includes the development of abilities to critically examine content--a form of critical skepticism. Constructed in this manner, education requires agreement to a rational process and the utilization of recognizable content. Even in these conditions the content and process are subject to critical examination themselves.

Education in this definition stands opposed to indoctrination beyond the acceptance of standards of rational discourse, with those standards subject to challenge through the process. To the extent that paradigms control those standards, as Kuhn (1970) notes, a level of skepticism needs to be reserved in education for the existing paradigms since they influence the determination of what can be considered rational in content and process. There is a realistic limit to those skeptical approaches that lead to circles of non-acceptance, indecision, or cynicism. We live in a time and with an intellectual endowment that precludes us from knowing future scientific paradigms with certainty. And we are required to make decisions and take actions within these constraints. Educational decisions and actions, however, influence the paradigms of succeeding generations. This calls for a thoughtful balance in education between teaching the constructs of knowledge currently accepted and teaching the means for challenging those constructs to permit adequate consideration of future ones.

These two main themes--increasing recognition of a disparately explained developing global economy, and the principle of education as continual enlightenment--converge in considering approaches to education about the world economy. It is reasonable that education should aproximate what is known about a subject.

Further, identified strands of economic dispute--ideology and nationalism--have their parallels in education. These strands provide obstacles to a pedagogy of skepticism and controversy because they limit the range of ideas, rationales and activities otherwise available. An understanding of these obstacles is important for a realistic appraisal of the relatively simple theme of this paper: education about world economics requires a pedagogy of skepticism and controversy. Skepticism refers to a concern for a process of examination; controversy refers to the content of the field. A skeptical student is not necessarily directed toward exessive neutrality, cynicism or nihilism. Rather, they follow Bertrand Russell's "middle ground" admonition about skepticism which states: "1) that when the experts are agreed, the opposite opinion cannot be held to be certain; 2) that when they are not agreed, no opinion can be regarded as certain by a non-expert; and 3) that when they all hold that no sufficient grounds for a positive opinion exits, the ordinary man would do well to suspend his judgment." (1928, p. 10). This is a mild, but radical departure from the norms of schooling in the United States. Examination of some of these norms, and the obstacles they present to skepticism and controversy, will involve illustrations of orthodox educational approaches in general and in regard to economics.

There is an abundant literature, with European intellectual roots, which covers ideological bases for schooling. Recent analyses by neo-Marxist and other critical scholars have demonstrated this dimension of schools. This literature includes the work of M. F. D. Young (1971), Whitty and Young (1976), Apple (1979), Giroux (1983), Bowles and Gintis (1976), and others. Although there is dispute among them, there is a consistency in this literature that western schools serve a cultural reproduction function based on ideology linked to capitalism. Further, they argue that the schools serve this function in a largely unexamined manner.

The uncritical acceptance of a functionalist world view is a standard in schools; the more critical views are not in the mainstream of educational thought in the United States, and are virtually ignored in literature and activities closest to school practice. (Besag & Nelson, 1984; Stanley, 1981; Fernekes, 1984). Writers from the critical perspective in the U. S. tend to write for each other, using language forms and style which render the works exceedingly obtuse, and that is a most unfortunate circumstance since the analyses provide a refreshing approach to the examination of schooling, but even more germane to this paper is that the controversial nature of critical works on education tends to keep this literature out of the mainstream of educational consideration. The standard teacher and administrator education programs provide little, if any, exposure to these ideas; the major educational publishers are not those producing these works; the most popular journals for teachers do not treat these subjects; and the public media seem not to know of their existence. The mere hint of Marxism, anti-capitalism, or anti-Americanism, is sufficient to cause rejection of the ideas.

In regard to nationalism, a strand within the concept of ideology, the schools have a long tradition as an agency for producing unthoughtful national patriotism. Every nation-state uses its school system as a means for indoctrinating chauvinistic views (Key, 1961). There are differences among countries in the extent to which nationalism dominates schooling, but it is a world-wide phenomenon which poses serious questions for attempts at global education (Nelson, 1976, 1978) and education about a world economy.

Examples of Obstacles to Enlightenment Education

These are very significant obstacles to an educational program which advocates critical skepticism and the examination of controversy. The manner by which these ideological and nationalistic obstacles confront and confound enlightened education by restricting and censoring can be illustrated by the following examples. A California state law requires:

> No teacher giving instruction in any school, or on any property belonging to any agencies included in the public school system, shall advocate or teach communisim with the intent to indoctrinate or to inculcate in the mind of any pupil a preference for communism. (California, 1975)

Nebraska has a law which prescribes three periods per week in two grades of each high school during which American citizenship is covered to include, "the benefits and advantages of our form of government and the dangers and fallacies of Nazism, Communism, and similar ideologies." (Nebraska)

The United States is, of course, not alone in regard to ideological and nationalistic biases in the schools. A long tradition of school censorship and political restraint can be documented in most countries. An examination of standard school books used in China showed heavy domination by nationalistic love of China and hate for imperialist America. (Ridley, 1971). Other school analysis show similar results in other countries (Krug, 1963; Murthy, 1973; Billington, 1966).

Professional socialization patterns of teachers, including their teacher education programs, push teachers to conservative mainstream views and to self-censorship and political restraint. Student teachers identified a variety of topics considered too controversial to be discussed in schools. (Palonsky and Nelson, 1980). And case study data suggest a high proportion of self-censorship among practicing teachers. (Nelson, 1983).

Obstacles in Economics Teaching

A Florida statute speaks to economics teaching:

> ...4. The course shall be one of orientation in comparative governments and shall emphasize the free-enterprise-competitive economy of the United States as the one which produces higher wages, high standards of living, greater personal freedom and liberty than any other system of economics on earth.
> ...7. No teacher or textual material assigned to this course shall present communism as preferable to the system of constitutional government and the free-enterprise-competitive economy indigenous to the United States. (Florida, 1967).

A review of teaching materials produced by corporations for free distribution to and use in schools, Hucksters in the Classroom (Harty, 1979), identified a large variety of corporation-serving materials, teacher workshops, and guest speakers. And, analyses of standard texts used in U. S. schools reveal serious limitations on economic views presented. (Anyon, 1978; Romanish, 1983). These restrictions included a lack of adequate treatment of labor, unions, and economic views differing from mainstream capitalism.

The following examples, drawn from interviews, express the views of individuals with considerable experience in economics education. From an economist who directed a major project in economics education:

> [Several states] have passed mandated courses or units in "Free Enterprise Economics." The very use of the term "free enterprise," which is not a scientific term but is an ideological one, gives some idea of the interest of legislatures... When we started developing our materials for Economics in Society (1963), we examined available material for teaching economics. I was appalled at that time at the bias in materials. These were from the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL-CIO, among others. The materials gave a very simple-minded economics. That kind of [sponsored] material has proliferated since that time. (Helburn, 1980).

From a current director of a Center for Economic Education at Louisiana State University:

> Economic education in the United States is definitely pro-capitalist and pro-corporation. These views are found in virtually all materials... You don't find advocacy for socialism or even for labor's views much. (Schober, 1980).

From the director of the Center for Economic Education, University of California, Los Angeles:

> Many of the organizations devoted to ecomomic education are advocates of a particular philosophy as opposed to being conveyors of information or inquirers. They are often agents of indoctrination rather than inquiry. (Kourilsky, 1980).

The views just presented reflect an approach in the United States. Apparently, related judgments can be made in Europe also. Georg Groth of the University of Berlin commented about Western Germany:

> In the schools, talking about socialism is very acceptable, but a teacher who talks about communism may get in trouble... A teacher can discuss the problem of communism-historically--but not as a probability nowadays [for West Germany]. Teachers with Marxist views will have trouble with the parents and maybe with school officials. (Groth, 1980).

Geoff Whitty, now of Kings College, University of London, responded:

> Most economics teaching [in England] is dominated by a perspective which sees pure, free market as the ideal... What is excluded from most economics teaching is the examination of alternative perspectives on the concept of market... The exclusion of Marxist perspective, for instance, is a feature of most academic economics departments in universities. (Whitty, 1980).

Obstacles to an education of enlightened skepticism and the study of controversy are evident. These obstacles include a mystique of scientific certainty in economics, ideological blinders and nationalistic bias in society and schools. The means used to continue the obstacles in schools include academic and profes-

sional programs of teacher education, socialization practices in schools, formal regulations governing schools, teaching materials, curricular structures, and pressure from the economic and political environment in which schools exist. While these are formidable, they are not insurmountable, and it is possible in the United States to find areas where repression of education has diminished over time. Teachers, for example, were much more restricted in personal lives as to dress, marriage, drinking, and other political and social activities before World War II than is now the case. Formal censorship of books and teachers was more acceptable and expected in previous times; it still occurs, and is apparently increasing again, but the means of redress are more readily available through the legal system or media.

There is, then, a recognition of serious obstacles to the kind of education proposed for global economics, and a note that the obstacles are subject to alterations. In economic terms there is a question of relative costs and benefits in pursuing a skeptical and controversial pedagogy about world economics. The obvious costs of continuing orthodox education in economics include a lack of adequate critical thought on economic issues, the production of true believers who lack understanding of the nature of economics, reluctance to accept change, intellectually irresponsible restrictions on teachers, texts and students, lack of an appropriate forum for debate among the mass of world citizens and a potential for violence based on uncritical protectionist views. The benefits of orthodox economics education include the comfort of tradition, support from governmental and major economic institutions in a society, less vulnerability to attack, and participation in the shared ideology of knowledge, nation and economic viewpoint.

Constructing a Pedagogy for World Economics

Several elements emerge from a consideration of economic and educational literature related to a rationale for skeptical and controversial teaching about world economics. These elements include the nature of economics as uncertainty and controversy, ideology and nationalism as dominant constructs in economics and education, and the array of obstacles to enlightened education in this area. An appropriate pedagogy for world economics would recognize, account for, and even utilize these disparate elements in the search for enlightenment.

If, as expressed here, economics is a highly controversial subject in theory, policy, and interpretation, it would be consistent to provide the uninitiated with an adequate understanding of the debate. Assuming a concern for continual enlightment as a basic premise for education, there follows a responsibility of schooling to reflect the content of the field in assisting students to understand it intelligently. This intelligent understanding requires that students become familiar with divergent views, including radical positions, and with a process for examining them which does not automatically relegate some of those views to a position of ridicule or disdain. There may be no such perfect process for bringing divergent views to equivalent scrutiny, but there is an educational need to strive for that. In this respect, there is a parallel between this proposal and the idea of discourse as expressed by Foucault (1976). In the pure form of discourse there is at least equality of discussants, agreement on criteria for making judgments, and symmetry in its structure and operation. The impure forms should strive for these ideals, making adjustments as education develops.

The specifics of an economy of the world need to be identified by economists, critics, educators, and other concerned representatives of various ideologies. That would not necessitate agreement; rather it would insure that the disagreements are

are more available to critical dispute in a setting that encourages consideration of disparate views Exposure to the dispute should be a major agenda item for schools. The essential content of economics, controversy, should be the content of education about world economics. The process, critical skepticism, requires this wide latitude in content and provides for consideration of future alternative views.

Ideology and nationalism are also subjects of appropriate scrutiny in schools. Ideology in its purest form is, after all, the study of ideas--and that is the most suitable subject for education. In its more commonly used form an ideology is a set of ethical and normative views which serve as a rationalization of group interests. Schooling should provide for a critical understanding of the nature, forms and uses of ideology (ies) to assist students in comprehending the roots of debate in world economics. Open examination of competing ideologies might prove more useful in insightful reading of news media than the standard school treatment of propaganda techniques.

Similarly, nationalistic bases for economic viewpoints and information should be explored in schools. An understanding of historic, contemporary and future alterations in political configurations, with the concept of nation-state as one recent example, provides perspective for contemplating divergent views in international economics and for considering future political structures not bound by the concept of nation. The study of nationalism in political, economic, and educational settings, pursued as an issue in social study, offers a means for examination of a world economy, a world politic, and a world education.

Study of ideology and nationalism as subjects of discourse and debate, while controversial itself, provide an opportunity for dealing with them as obstacles to enlightenment. Incidents of censorship and political restraint become examples

for class analysis. The purpose for using them is to further study of ideology and nationalism, not simple derision or advocacy of protest. In some instances derision or protest are fully appropriate behaviors, but the general framework would be educational. Restraints on knowledge are antithetical to enlightenment, and restricted consideration of ideology and nationalism are detrimental to adequate understanding of the dynamics of knowledge development and legitimation. Skeptical and controversial education exposes defects in ideology, operates against censorship, and permits consideration of new ideas about a global economy.

In order for this form of education to develop it is essential that alterations occur in teacher education and in the professional socialization of teachers. Course work in economics, history and other social sciences needs to provide a broader range of ideas extending to radical critiques, than is now standard in higher education. Efforts in these courses should be directed at stimulating critical skepticism rather than factual recall, since many teachers teach as they were taught. Study of ideological and paradigmatic strictures on scholarship should be included to encourage the willing suspension of belief in consideration of alternative views. This work in philosophy and epistemology is lacking in virtually all teacher education programs. Students tend to be trained rather than educated in the relevant subjects. Similarly, professional study for teaching needs to expand consideration of the diversity of educational ideas and criticisms. Further, such study should devote considerable energy to ethical and intellectual responsibilities of teachers and academic freedom. Study of views and conflicts in world economics is obviously important for those preparing to teach in this area. Yet, very few people preparing to teach have taken such work.

One of the major difficulties in overcoming obstacles to skeptical and controversial teaching is that graduates of teacher education, when employed as teachers, are thrust into school situations which tend to stifle their intellectual and critical interests. The ethos of the school, with senior teachers having become increasingly conservative, administrators excessively fearful of controversy, bland and unidimensional teaching materials, heavy work loads, and a climate of authority and suppression, shifts the orientation of new teachers from exploring divergent ideas to survival and comfort. This socialization pattern may be hard to break, but some modification can occur over time if a different view of schooling can arise. In addition, the standard professional socialization of teachers is an area relatively unstudied and unconscious (Nelson, 1983). The posing of it as an area of concern serves to raise the consciousness of those engaged in it, and to consideration of change. Undertaking thorough examination of teacher life in schools would emphasize this topic, and could lead to dramatic alterations in the pattern of intellectual stagnation. This could be a major focus of scholarly interest in education, and could produce significant results.

Alterations in teaching materials available follow teacher interest. So long as teachers are prepared only in orthodox economic and educational thought, and are socialized into intellectually sterile school settings, there will be no demand for diverse or provocative materials. Those teachers who now engage in controversial education hunt to find appropriate materials and have varying degrees of success. It is now possible to find such material, but it is not as conveniently packaged or available as standard views. We need some directed effort among teachers, economists, educationists and others to chart the domain of world economics in a manner which permits translation into school settings - teaching materials, supportive theory, teacher preparation, etc. - but is not limited to nationalistic blinders.

An issue of more importance than teaching materials is the political climate in which the schools reside. Finding controversial material takes effort, being able to use it requires education. The public, and school authorities, need to be educated to recognize the value of free exchange of ideas in schools, and the necessity to protect academic freedom. This is a much more difficult and delicate activity, one that demands competent teachers and a supportive profession. Teaching about world economics in a manner that involves controversy and skepticism is threatening to many. The fact of severe political restraint on teachers, including censorship of teaching materials, is evidence that previous mass education has not been enlightenment. The fact of some modest improvement in this condition suggests the educability of people.

Collateral efforts of teachers from universities and schools, strong positions by professional associations, development of legal and public policy documents of support, and thoughtful public presentation of the case for controversy and academic freedom in schools would assist in that education.

While it is disheartening to read prior expositions of censorship and political restraint of teachers (Pierce, 1933; Beale, 1936), and to recognize that adequate academic freedom has yet to be assured (O'Neil, 1981), it is a condition which requires continuing vigilance and periodically restored vitality to resist encroachments. In considering the teaching of world economics, these factors become increasingly of interest to those who desire education rather than indoctrination.

This paper has proposed that the subject of economics is, at its base, controversy. It also argues that global economics is not a simple extension of nationalistic views of economics to the world level, although imperialism demands that doctrine. And it posits the idea of an education which is compatible with the nature of economics but recognizes nationalistic and ideological obstacles to enlightenment about a global economy.

Incorporating controversy on world economics into social education is consistent with the nature of economics and education, supportable in its intellectual rationale, compatible with the concept of enlightened political participation in a democracy, and sufficiently important to attempt to overcome substantial obstacles. World economics requires controversial and skeptical education.

References

Anyon, Jean. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimating Knowledge." Theory and Research in Social Education. 6:3, 40-35, 1978.

Apple, Michael. Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Arnold, Thurman. The Folklore of Capitalism. New Haven, CN: Yale University Press, 1937; new preface 1962.

Beale, Howard K. Are American Teachers Free? New York: Scribners, 1936.

Besag, Frank and Jack L. Nelson. Foundations of Education: Stasis and Change. New York: Random House, 1984.

Billington, Ray Allen, et al. The Historians Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding. London: Hobbs, Dorman, 1966.

Bookchin, Murray. Post-Scarcity Anarchism. Berkeley CA: Ramparts Press, 1971.

Boulding, Kenneth. Beyond Economics. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

California State Education Code, At. 4, Sect. 9031, 1975 Edition.

Clark, J. J. The New Economics of National Defense. New York: Random House, 1966.

Davidson, Paul. "Post-Keynesian Economics: Solving the Crisis in Economic Theory," The Public Interest, Special Edition, 1980.

Davis, James E., At Issue: Free Enterprise Education, Fact Sheet no. 11, Boulder, CO: ERIC/ChESS, September, 1983.

Fernekes, William. Analysis of Critical Literature in early chapters of dissertation in process; interviews, Rutgers University, 1984.

Florida Statutes. Section 230.23 (4) (1).

Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Friedman, Milton. Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Fromm, Eric. May Man Prevail. New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. The New Industrial State. Boston: Houghton Miflin, 1967.

Galtung, Johan. The North/South Debate: Technology, Basic Human Needs and The New International Economic Order. New York: Institute for World Order, 1980.

Gintis, Herbert. "American Keynesianism and the War Machine," in Poverty Economics. Boston: New England Free Press. 1968.

Giroux, Henry. Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition. South Hadley MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1983.

Groth, Georg. Interview, July, 1980.

Harty, Sheila. Hucksters in the Classroom. Washington, D.C.: Center for Study of Responsive Law. 1979.

Hechinger, Fred. "The Corporation in the Classroom." Saturday Review. September 16, 1978, pp 14, 15.

Helburn, Suzanne. Interview, July, 1980.

Johnson, Paul. Will Capitalism Survive? ed. by Ernest Lefever. Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center of Georgetown University, 1979.

Kahn, Herman. "Social Limits to Economic Growth," in Paul Johnson Will Capitalism Survive? Washington, D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center of Georgestown University, 1979.

Kay, Geoffrey. The Economic Theory of the Working Class. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979.

Kissinger, Henry. "Maintaining the Momentum Toward Peace." U. N. Speech, U. S. Department of State. September 23, 1974.

Kourilsky, Marilyn. Telephone Interview. September, 1980.

Krug, Mark. "The Teaching of History at the Center of the Cold War--History Textbooks in East and West Germany." School Review, 1961.

Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2nd Ed., Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Murthy, P. A. Narasimha. The Rise of Modern Nationalism in Japan. New Delhi: Askajanak Publishers, 1973.

Nebraska School Laws: 79-213.

Nelson, Jack L. "Nationalistic Political Education: An Examination of Traditions and Potentials," Cambridge Journal of Education, 8:2, Michaelmas Term, 1978.

Nelson, Jack L. "Nationalistic vs. Global Education," Theory and Research in Social Education. 4:1, August, 1976, pp 33-50.

Nelson, Jack L. "Professional Socialization of Social Studies Teachers," in New Directions in Social Science Teacher Education. Charles Berryman and Marion Rice, eds., Athens GA: University of Georgia, 1983.

New York Times, January 9, 1984, p. 1.

O'Neil, Robert M. Classrooms in the Crossfire. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 1981.

Palonsky, Stuart and Jack L. Nelson. "Political Restraint in the Socialization of Student Teachers," Theory and Research in Social Education. 7:4, Winter, 1980, pp. 19-34.

Pierce, Bessie. Citizens'Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth. New York: Scribners, 1933.

Ridley, Charles, et al., The Making of a Model Citizen in Communist China. Stanford, CA: Hoover Instituion Press, 1971.

Rifkin, Jeremy. Entropy: A New World View. New York: Viking Press, 1980.

Robinson, Joan. "The Economics of Destruction." Monthly Review. October, 1983, pp. 15-17.

Romanish, Bruce. "Modern Secondary Economics Textbooks and Ideological Bias," Theory and Research in Social Education. 11:1, 1-24, Spring, 1983.

Rousseas, Stephen. Capitalism and Catastrophe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Russell, Bertrand. Sceptical Essays. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1928.

Schober, Howard. Interview, May, 1980.

Servan-Schreiber, Jean-Jacques. The Radical Alternative. New York: Dell, 1971.

Shackleton, J. R. and Gareth Locksley. Twelve Contemporary Economists. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Simon, William. A Time for Truth. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Stanley, William. "The Radical Reconstructionist Rationale for Social Education." Theory and Research in Social Education. 8:4, 55-79, 1981.

Theobald, Robert. The Economics of Abundance. New York: Pitman, 1970.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. NY: Random House, 1970.

Whitty, Geoff. Interview, July, 1980.

Whitty, Geoff and M. F. D. Young. Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge. Nafferton, England: Nafferton Books, 1976,.

World Economic Recovery. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. United Nations, 1982.

Young, Michael, F. D. ed., Knowledge & Control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.

Shackleton, J. R. and Gareth Locksley. Twelve Contemporary Economists. London: Macmillan, 1981.

Simon, William. A Time for Truth. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

Stanley, William. "The Radical Reconstructionist Rationale for Social Education." Theory and Research in Social Education. 8:4, 55-79, 1981.

Theobald, Robert. The Economics of Abundance. New York: Pitman, 1970.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. NY: Random House, 1970.

Whitty, Geoff. Interview, July, 1980.

Whitty, Geoff and M. F. D. Young. Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge. Nafferton, England: Nafferton Books, 1976,.

World Economic Recovery. Department of International Economic and Social Affairs. United Nations, 1982.

Young, Michael, F. D. ed., Knowledge & Control. London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971.